

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ELECTRONIC

12/14/2007

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. AD7006USNA 8340 10/809,470 03/25/2004 Steven M. Hansen 12/14/2007 7590 **EXAMINER** E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY ZEMEL, IRINA SOPJIA LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 4417 LANCASTER PIKE 1796 WILMINGTON, DE 19805 **DELIVERY MODE** NOTIFICATION DATE

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
10/809,470	HANSEN ET AL.	HANSEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Irina S. Zemel	1796			

	Irina S. Zemel	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cf	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office.	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complicing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will not be entered be	ecause
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		Il be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13 and 30-32</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	A 1.	1
13. Other:		mafer	ul
		Irina S. Zemel Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1796	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented at this time are not found persuasive. The applicants, once again, arfue that the cited references do not disclose the claimed size fibers. The applicants base their arguments on the selective disclosures of the reference, i.e., the mid point of average dimensions of the fibers disclosed in each of the references. However, the examiner point out once again, that the disclosure of the cited reference is not limited to the average disclosed size, and the references expressly of implisitly disclose other sizes, such as lower limitation of the length, and aspect rationthat correspond to the claimed parameters, and also disclose possibility of variations in BET. Thus, comparing average sizes of the claimed fibers with the average size of the disclosed size is not proper as neither the disclosure of the references, not the claimed fibers are limited to any one specific size and define a whole broad range of sizes, including end points and anything in between.

IRINA ZEMEL PRIMARY EXAMINER